PETITION UNDER 28 USC § 2254 FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS BY A PERSON IN STATE CUSTODY

	United States District Court	District Massachusetts	14.50
Nam	Edward A. Given	Prisoner No. M-15113	Casé No. (1)
Place	of Confinement Massachusetts Treatment Center 30 Administration Rd. Bridgewater, MA 02324		1/1 2 40 1/1 2 40
Nam	e of Petitioner (include name under which convicted)	Name of Respondent (authorized	person having custody of petitione
	Edward A. Given	V. Robert Murphy, S. MAGISTRAT	1)
The .	Attorney General of the State of: Massachusetts		
	PET	TTION	
1.	Name and location of court which entered the judgment of court	onviction under attack	
	Worcester Superior Court, 2 Main	St. Worcester, MA 0	1608
2.	Date of judgment of conviction July 12, 2001		
3.	Length of sentence A day to life.		
1	Nature of offense involved (all counts) The petition	ner was adjudged to b	velfenvas e e
4.	dangerous person, and civilly con		
	Treatment Center for day to life		
5.	What was your plea? (Check one) (a) Not guilty (b) Guilty (c) Nolo contendere		
	If you entered a guilty plea to one count or indictment, and n	ot a guilty plea to another count	or indictment, give details:
6.	If you pleaded not guilty, what kind of trial did you have? (C. (a) Jury (b) Judge only	heck one)	
7.	Did you testify at the trial? Yes No□		
3.	Did you appeal from the judgment of conviction? Yes No□		

40 2	241 (Rev. 5/85)
9.	If you did appeal, answer the following:
	(a) Name of court Massachusetts Appeals Court
	(b) Result The judgment of the Superior Court was reversed and new trial was ordered.
	(c) Date of result and citation, if known September 24, 2003 59 Mass. App. Ct. 390, 796 N.E. 845
	(d) Grounds raised The inadmissibility of hearsay evidence contained in a police report and failure to define "likely to engage in sexual offenses" as in Kansas v. Crane, 534 U.S. 407, 413 (2002), to distinguish
	the petitioner from the dangerous but typical recidivist in a criminal case (e) If you sought further review of the decision on appeal by a higher state court, please answer the following: The District Attorney sought further appellate review in the Supreme (1) Name of court
	Judical Court of Massachusetts. (2) Result The decision of the Massachusetts Appeals Court was reversed
	and the judgment of commitment by the Superior Court was affirmed.
	(3) Date of result and citation, if known May 20, 2004, 441 Mass. 741, 808 N.E.2d 788
	(4) Grounds raised admission of unreliable evidence including hearsay evidence in violation of the petitioner's right to due process of law, including the right to confrontation and cross examination.
	(1) Name of court The United States Supreme Court. (2) Result Petition for certiorari denied.
	(3) Date of result and citation, if known October 18, 2004, 160 L.Ed.2d 264
	(4) Grounds raised whether the petitioner facing lifetime civil commitment
	has a due process right to confrontation and cross examination
	of witnesses against the petitioner. Other than a direct appeal from the judgment of conviction and sentence, have you previously filed any petitions, applications, or motions with respect to this judgment in any court, state or federal? Yes \(\sigma\) No \(\sigma\)
1.	If your answer to 10 was "yes," give the following information:
((a) (1) Name of court
	(2) Nature of proceeding
	(3) Grounds raised

(1) Name of court (2) Nature of proceeding (3) Grounds raised (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes No (5) Result (6) Date of result (c) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction the result of action taken on any petition, applicate motion? (1) First petition, etc. Yes No (2) Second petition, etc. Yes No (3) Grounds raised	41 (F	ev. 5	/85)
(4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes □ No□ (5) Result □ (6) Date of result □ (1) Name of court □ (2) Nature of proceeding □ (3) Grounds raised □ (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes □ No□ (5) Result □ (6) Date of result □ (7) No□ (8) Result □ (9) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction the result of action taken on any petition, applicate motion? (1) First petition, etc Yes □ No□ (2) Second petition, etc. Yes □ No□			
(4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes \ \text{No} \ \text{No} \ \text{(6) Date of result } \ \text{(6) Date of result } \ \text{(1) Name of court } \ \text{(2) Nature of proceeding } \ \text{(3) Grounds raised } \ \text{(3) Grounds raised } \ \text{(5) Result } \ \text{(6) Date of result } \ \text{(6) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction the result of action taken on any petition, application? (1) First petition, etc. \text{Yes} \text{No} \text{No} \text{No} \text{No} \text{No} \text{No}			•
(4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes □ No□ (5) Result (6) Date of result (b) As to any second petition, application or motion give the same information: (1) Name of court (2) Nature of proceeding (3) Grounds raised (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes □ No□ (5) Result (6) Date of result (7) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction the result of action taken on any petition, application motion? (1) First petition, etc. Yes □ No□ (2) Second petition, etc. Yes □ No□			
(6) Date of result (b) As to any second petition, application or motion give the same information: (1) Name of court (2) Nature of proceeding (3) Grounds raised (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes No (5) Result (6) Date of result (7) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction the result of action taken on any petition, application? (1) First petition, etc. Yes No (2) Second petition, etc. Yes No (3) Grounds raised		(4)	Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion?
(b) As to any second petition, application or motion give the same information: (1) Name of court (2) Nature of proceeding (3) Grounds raised (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes No (5) Result (6) Date of result (7) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction the result of action taken on any petition, application? (1) First petition, etc. Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No		(5)	Result
(2) Nature of proceeding (3) Grounds raised (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes No (5) Result (6) Date of result (c) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction the result of action taken on any petition, applicate motion? (1) First petition, etc. Yes No (2) Second petition, etc. Yes No		(6)	Date of result
(2) Nature of proceeding (3) Grounds raised (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes	(b)	As t	to any second petition, application or motion give the same information:
(3) Grounds raised (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes \(\) No \(\) (5) Result (6) Date of result (6) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction the result of action taken on any petition, applicat motion? (1) First petition, etc. Yes \(\) No \(\) (2) Second petition, etc. Yes \(\) No \(\)		(1)	Name of court
(3) Grounds raised (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes No (5) Result (6) Date of result (c) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction the result of action taken on any petition, applicate motion? (1) First petition, etc. Yes No No Second petition, etc. Yes No No		(2)	Nature of proceeding
 (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes □ No□ (5) Result		(3)	Grounds raised
 (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes □ No□ (5) Result			
 (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes □ No□ (5) Result		,	
 (4) Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion? Yes □ No□ (5) Result			
(6) Date of result (c) Did you appeal to the highest state court having jurisdiction the result of action taken on any petition, applicate motion? (1) First petition, etc. Yes No No (2) Second petition, etc. Yes No (3) No (4)	((4)	Did you receive an evidentiary hearing on your petition, application or motion?
(6) Date of result	((5)	Result
motion? (1) First petition, etc. Yes \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc			
(2) Second petition, etc. Yes \(\sigma\) No \(\sigma\)	1	moti	
a) It you did not appeal from the adverse action on any petition, application or motion, explain briefly why you did not	'd) I	íf vo	au did not appeal from the adverse action on any petition, application or motion, explain briefly why you did not:
	, -) -	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	•		
	-		
State concisely every ground on which you claim that you are being held unlawfully. Summarize briefly the facts supp	State	COV	acisely every ground on which you claim that you are being held unlawfully. Summarize briefly the facts grantering

you may be barred from presenting additional grounds at a later date.

12.

For your information, the following is a list of the most frequently raised grounds for relief in habeas corpus proceedin Each statement preceded by a letter constitutes a separate ground for possible relief. You may raise any grounds which you mean have other than those listed if you have exhausted you state court remedies with respect to them. However, you should raise this petition all available grounds (relating to this conviction) on which you base your allegations that you are being held custody unlawfully.

Do not check any of these listed grounds. If you select one or more of these grounds for relief, you must allege facts. T petition will be returned to you if you merely check (a) through (j) or any one of these grounds.

- (a) Conviction obtained by plea of guilty which was unlawfully induced or not made voluntarily with understanding of the nature of the charge and the consequences of the plea.
- (b) Conviction obtained by use of coerced confession.
- (c) Conviction obtained by use of evidence gained pursuant to an unconstitutional search and seizure.
- (d) Conviction obtained by use of evidence obtained pursuant to an unlawful arrest.
- (e) Conviction obtained by a violation of the privilege against self-incrimination.
- (f) Conviction obtained by the unconstitutional failure of the prosecution to disclose to the defendant evidence favorable t the defendant.
- (g) Conviction obtained by a violation of the protection against double jeopardy.
- (h) Conviction obtained by action of a grand or petit jury which was unconstitutionally selected and impaneled.
- (i) Denial of effective assistance of counsel.
- (h) Denial of right of appeal.

due process	of law, including the reess against him.	ation of the petitioner's rghi ight to confront and cross
nporting FACTS (sta	te briefly without citing cases or law)	Please see attached.
pporting PAC 13 (sta	te briefly without citing cases of lawy	
	•	
ound two: The ind	gment of commitment was	obtained with unconstitution
ague and overl ffenses" in vi	v broad definition of "	obtained with unconstitution likely to engage in sexual ers right to due process of Please see attached.
ague and overl ffenses" in vi aw.	y broad definition of " olation of the petition	ers right to due process of
ague and overl ffenses" in vi aw.	y broad definition of " olation of the petition	ers right to due process of
ague and overl ffenses" in vi aw.	y broad definition of " olation of the petition	ers right to due process of
ague and overl ffenses" in vi aw.	y broad definition of " olation of the petition	ers right to due process of
ague and overl ffenses" in vi aw.	y broad definition of " olation of the petition	ers right to due process of
ague and overl ffenses" in vi aw.	y broad definition of " olation of the petition	ers right to due process of
ague and overl ffenses" in vi aw.	y broad definition of " olation of the petition	ers right to due process of

C	Ground three:
	Supporting FACTS (state briefly without citing cases or law)
D.	Ground four:
	Supporting FACTS (state briefly without citing cases or law)
. If any o	f the grounds listed in 12A, B, C, and D were not previously presented in any other court, state or federal, state briefly bunds were not so presented, and give your reasons for not presenting them:
. Do you Yes □	have any petition or appeal now pending in any court, either state or federal, as to the judgment under attack? No
. Give the	name and address, if known, of each attorney who represented you in the following stages of judgment attacked herein:
(a)	At preliminary hearing
(b)	At arraignment and plea

AO	241 (F	Rev. 5/85)
). *	(c)	At trial
	(d)	At sentencing
	(e)	On appeal
	(f)	In any post—conviction proceeding
	(g)	On appeal from any adverse ruling in a post—conviction proceeding
16.	Were same	e you sentenced on more than one count of an indictment, or on more than one indictment, in the same court and the time? No No
17.	Yes	rou have any future sentence to serve after you complete the sentence imposed by the judgment under attack? No If so, give name and location of court which imposed sentence to be served in the future:
	(b) (Give date and length of the above sentence:
	S	Have you filed, or do you contemplate filing, any petition attacking the judgment which imposed the sentence to be served in the future? Yes No
	Whe	refore, petitioner prays that the Court grant petitioner relief to which he may be entitled in this proceeding.
		Signature of Attorney (if any).
	I dec	lare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on 7-12-05 (date)
		(date) Signature of Petitioner

Attachment to the Petition for Writ Habeas Corpus of Edward A. Given

12. Concise Statment of Grounds.

A. Ground One:

The judgment of commitment was obtained by the introduction of unreliable hearsay evidence in violation of the petitioner's right to due process of law, including the right to confront and cross exam witnesses against him.

Supporting Facts:

In November, 2000, the Commonwealth commenced proceedings to commit the petitioner as a sexually dangerous person for an indefinite period of one day to life, as provided by M.G.L. c. 123A, §§ 12-16. The case was tried to a jury in the Superior Court at Worcester.

At trial the Commonwealth introduced evidence that the petitioner had been convicted of sexually assaulting a mentally retarded twelve year old girl, "Francine." (A pseudonym used in both the Massachusetts Appeals Court and Supreme Judicial Court opinions.) Over objection, the Commonwealth was allowed to introduce police reports concerning the incident, including allegation that Francine had told the police that the petitioner had similarly assaulted a six year old boy at or near the same time, in the same parked car.

The jury found beyond a reasonable doubt that the petitioner is a "sexaully dangerous person," and the trial court committed the petitioner to indefinite term of a day to life in the Massachusetts Treatment Center, pursant to G.L. c. 123A, § 14(d).

The petitioner has never admitted that there was six year old boy present when the offense against Francine ocurred.

The petitioner has never admitted that he committed any offense against the six year old boy. The petitioner has never been charged with any offense against the six year old boy, much less convicted of any offense against this unidentified six year old boy.

The only information, that any one has about the alleged offense against the six year old boy, comes from what the police officer wrote down in the report, based on what Francine said the unidentified six year old boy said.

This unreliable hearsay evidence supports an inference that petitioner was actively seeking victims beyond those who were known to him and enhances a portrayal of him as a predator who was out of control and not likely to be able to control his behavior outside of a secure facility. The setting of the alleged incident was one in which he was essentially portrayed as assaulting two victims of different genders and markedly different ages more or less simultaneously, a picture that had a high potential of influencing the jury's assessment of his ability to control his future conduct.

The introduction of these police reports over the petitioner's objection, afforded the petitioner no opportunity to confront and cross examine: the police officer, Francine, or the unidentified boy.

Under clearly estblished precedents of the U.S. Supreme Court the petition must not be committed using unreliable evidence, and the right to confront and crossexamine witnesses against him, as guaranteed by the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendment's right to due process.

B. Ground Two:

The judgment of commitment was obtained by an unconstitutionally vague and overbroad definition of sexual dangerousness.

Supporting Facts:

At the conclusion of evidence the petitioner submitted a request that the judge instruct the jury that in the context of the SDP statute the definition of likely meant certainty of future to engage in sexual offenses. The judge gave no instruction to jury on the meaning of likely as the word is used in the definition of a "sexually dangerous person" in G.L. c. 123A, § 1. the relevant portion of which is:

"'Sexually dangerous person,' any person who has been (i) convicted of...a sexual offense and who suffers from a mental abnormality or personality disorder which makes the person <u>likely</u> to engage in sexual offenses if not confined to a secure facility...." (underlining added).

Without an appropriate definition of likely, neither the statute nor the judge's instructions provided a way for the jury to distinguish whether the petitioner was a dangerous sexual offender properly subject to civil commitment or just a dangerous but typical recidivist more properly dealt with through criminal proceedings.

It is a violation of due process of law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution to use civil commitment as a mechanism for retribution or general deterence. If the definition of mental abnormality is too imprecise a category to offer a solid basis for concluding that civil commitment is justified, then it is unconstitutionally vague and overbroad, in violation of the petitioner's right to due process. At the present time 10% of all males in the United

States will be incarcerated under a criminal sentence at some point in their lives. Of persons incarcerated in Massachusetts the Department of Correction says 50 to 60% will reoffend with three years of being released from prison. In defining whether the peitioner should be considered sexually dangerous the definition must be sufficiently precise to distinguish the petitioner from the 10% of all U.S. males who will be incarcerated for criminal offenses during their life, and from the 60% of incarcerated offenders, who are dangerous and will reoffend. Without a definition of "likely" to reoffend that distinguishes the petitioner from other persons with histories of past dangerous criminal conduct which makes them quite likely to reoffend, the statute becomes nothing more than an mechanism for general deterence.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

1. V •	Robe	ert M	(NAME OF FIRST PARTY ON E Turphy, Superinte	ACH SIDE ONLY) Edward A endent, Respondent	. Given, Petitioner
2.	CATEG	ORY IN V	WHICH THE CASE BELONGS BA	ASED UPON THE NUMBERED NATU	IRE OF SUIT CODE LISTED ON THE CIVIL
	COVER	SHEET.	(SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(A)(1))		
		I.	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARD	LESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.	
	_	If.		540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730,)*, 850, 890, 892-894, 895, 950.	*Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 for patent, trademark or copyright cases
	_	III.	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 380, 385, 450, 891.	355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371,	Service Control of the Control of th
	X	IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871,	63), 5 620, 630, 4 0, 6 0, 6 0	63 NMG
		V.	150, 152, 153.		
3.	HAS BE	EN FILE			F MORE THAN ONE PRIOR RELATED CASE OF THE FIRST FILED CASE IN THIS COURT.
	Non	e.			
4.	HAS AF		CTION BETWEEN THE SAME PA	ARTIES AND BASED ON THE SAME	CLAIM EVER BEEN FILED IN THIS
				YES	(NO3)
5.			PLAINT IN THIS CASE QUESTIC ST? (SEE 28 USC §2403)		NACT OF CONGRESS AFFECTING THE
	IF SO, 15	S THE U.	S.A. OR AN OFFICER, AGENT (YES OR EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. A PART	TY? NO
				YES	NO
6.	IS THIS 28 USC		EQUIRED TO BE HEARD AND D	ETERMINED BY A DISTRICT COUR	T OF THREE JUDGES PURSUANT TO TITLE
		•		YES	NO
7.	COMMO	NWEAL		VERNMENTAL AGENCIES"), RESID	CIES OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE DING IN MASSACHUSETTS RESIDE IN THE
				YES	NO
		A.	IF YES, IN WHICH DIVISION I	DO ALL OF THE NON-GOVERNMEN	ITAL PARTES RESIDE?
		(EASTERN DIVISION	CENTRAL DIVISION	WESTERN DIVISION
		В.		O THE MAJORITY OF THE PLAINTII S, RESIDING IN MASSACHUSETTS	FFS OR THE ONLY PARTIES, EXCLUDING RESIDE?
			EASTERN DIVISION	CENTRAL DIVISION	WESTERN DIVISION
(PL	EASE TY	PE OR F	PRINT)		
ΑT	TORNEY	S NAME	Edward A. Give	n, Pro Se	
ΑD	DRESS_		30 Administrat	ion Rd., Bridgewat	er, MA 02324
TE	LEPHON	E NO			
(Co	over shee	t local.w	rpd - 11/27/00)		

CIVIL COVER SHELT

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as reby law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

 by law, except as provided of the Clerk of Court for the 	purpose of initiating the	civil docket shee	t. (SEE IN	STRUCTIONS ON THE R	EVERSE OF	THE FORM.)	nber 1974, is it)
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS		No. 2	(Plan
Edward	A. Given, Pet	itioner		Robert Mur Respondent	cphy, S	uperint	endent,	240 240
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE (EXCER	OF FIRST LISTED PLAINTIFF PT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA	Plymouth_		COUNTY OF RESIDENCE O NOTE: IN LAND CONDE TRACT OF LAND	(IN U.S. PLA			
30 Adm: Bridgev	A. Given, Proint inistration Rowater, MA 0233	o Se 1. 24	lui cit	ATTORNEYS (F KNOWN) Mary Murray DOC Legal 30 Administ Bridgewater	ration , MA 02	2324		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	OICTION (PLACE AN	.X. IN ONE BOX OUTA)		Diversity Cases Only)	TF DEF		AND ONE BOX FOR	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government	ent Not a Party)	Ci				or Principal Pl In This State	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizer in Item III)	nship of Parties	Ci	itizen of Another State □ itizen or Subject of a □ Foreign Country			and Principal f In Another Sta In	
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (PLACE AN "X" IN ON	IE BOX ONLY)		·				·
CONTRACT		ORTS	1	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKR	RUPTCY	OTHER	STATUTES
☐ 110 Insurance ☐ 120 Marine ☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment ☐ 151 Medicare Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) ☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability	PERSONAL IN 362 Personal Inju Med. Maipr 365 Personal inju Product Liat 368 Asbestos Per Injury Produ PERSONAL PRO 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lend	ury actice ury bility rsonal ct Liability PERTY	☐ 610 Agriculture ☐ 620 Other Food & Drug ☐ 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 661 ☐ 630 Liquor Laws ☐ 640 R.R. & Truck ☐ 650 Airline Regs. ☐ 660 Occupational Safety/Health ☐ 690 Other	423 Withold 26 US PROPERT 620 Copyr 830 Patent 840 Trader	IV RIGHTS rights t	460 Deportat	nd Banking roe/ICC Rates/etc. tion er Influenced and Organizations e Service es/Commodities/ er Challenge
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability	350 Motor Vehicle 555 Motor Vehicle Froduct Liability 560 Other Personal Injury		mage mage ility	LABOR ☐ 710 Fair Labor Standards Act ☐ 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	□ 961 HIA (1:	Lung (923) /DIWW (405(g))	☐ 893 Environm ☐ 894 Energy A	iral Acts ic Stabilization Act nental Matters Mocation Act
REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 444 Welfare 440 Other Civil Rights	PRISONER PET 510 Motions to V Sentence HABEAS CORPL 530 General 535 Death Penall 540 Mandamus & 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Conc	acate JS; y L Other	☐ 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act ☐ 740 Railway Labor Act ☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	865 RSI (40) FEDERAL 870 Taxes or Dete	TAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiffenidant) - Third Party		on Act of Fee Determination qual Access to Justionality of others
		(PLACE A	Ł.	NE BOX ONLY) Transferre	ed from	c 7609 g 6 Multidistric Litigation	J ct ⊟7N	Appeal to Distr ludge from Magistrate ludgment
1. CAUSE OF ACTIO	DO NOT CITE JURISDIC	TIONAL STATUTES UNL	ESS DIVERS					
Petit	ion for habea	s corpus,	pursu	ant to 28 U.S	.c. § 2	2254		
II. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THIS IS UNDER ER.C.P. 23		ION	DEMAND \$		HECK YES on	nly if demanded	1.0
III.RELATED CASE(S	(See instructions):	DDGE			DOCKET NU	JMBER		
8/3/04		SIGNATURE OF AT	TORNEY OF	RECORD A	in			
IR OFFICE USE ONLY				•				